DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 649 EF 005 838

TITLE	The Chicago Public Schools Design Competition, 2000-2001. Big Shoulders, Small Schools Competition Program.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Public Schools, IL.; Small Schools Coalition, Chicago, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	51p.; Sponsored by the Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities, Chicago, Business & Professional People for the Public Interest, and Leadership for Quality Education. Funding received from the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, The Oppenheimer Family Foundation, and the Chicago Association of Realtors Education Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.schooldesigncomp.org/compProgram.htm.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Facilities Design; Elementary Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	Chicago Public Schools IL; *Design Competition

ABSTRACT

This document describes the Big Shoulders, Small Schools Chicago Public Schools Design Competition; provides a description of the school communities and sites involved; presents the presentation requirements, procedures, and regulations; and examines the universal design and small schools concepts. The national design competition will produce two new public pre-k-8th grade schools designed to serve an integrated population of disabled and nondisabled students. Appendices provide the Big Shoulders, Small Schools entry form and maps, photos, and surveys of Chicago North and South side sites. (GR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 649

The Chicago Public Schools Design Competition

2000/2001

Big Shoulders, Small Schools

Competition Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

http://www.schooldesigncomp.org/compProgram.htm

"These schools are as important to their neighborhoods and to the city as any mansion These are landmarks, imposing but not overwhelming representations of a city's commitment to Quality education that give their predominantly poor neighborhoods pride and a sense of place. These are the everyday masterpieces, architecture in the service of democracy."

--Robert A.M. Stern (Dean, Yale School of Architecture)

EF 005 838

1 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgments

The Sponsors of the Chicago Public Schools Design Competition would like to thank The Richard H. Driehaus Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, The Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, The Oppenheimer Family Foundation, and the Chicago Association of Realtors Education Foundation for their generous support of this Project.

We also acknowledge Women in Planning and Development; The Architecture League of New York; the Public Education Association; Karla Seelandt at DeStefano & Partners; Jack Nessner at Chicago Public Schools Specialized Services; Giacomo Mancuso at Chicago Public Schools Capital Programming and Demographics; and Laurel Berman at Chicago Public Schools for assistance in developing this Program.

Finally, the Sponsors would like to thank the Steering Committee for the Big Shoulders Competition – a group of individuals who have given generously of their time and support throughout all aspects of this Competition process.

NATIONAL
ENDOWMENT
FOR THE ARTS

THE RICHARD H. DRIEHAUS FOUNDATION

Cover art by Janie Allen

A Program for The Chicago Public Schools Design Competition

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction

- The Sponsors
- Background
- The Design Competition

Section 2: Description of School Communities & Sites

- South Side Site
- North Side Site

Section 3: The Competition Program

- Evaluation Criteria
- The Program
- The Facilities Program
- General Guidelines
- Zoning and Code Information

Section 4: Presentation Requirements

- Presentation Format
- Presentation Content
- Presentation Techniques

Section 5: Procedures and Regulations

- Eligibility
- Site Selection
- Competition Registration & Entry
- Disqualification
- The Competition Advisor
- The Jury
- The Invited Architects
- Review of Stage One Finalists
- Preparation of Stage Two Program
- Stage Two Procedures, Jury Process and Presentation
- Competition Web Site
- Finalist Stipends and Awards
- Community/Neighborhood Workshops
- Announcement of Competition Winners
- Ownership and Use of Submissions
- Ownership of Designs
- Anonymity of Submissions
- Packaging and Delivery of Submissions
- Return of Submissions
- Schedule

Section 6: Universal Design and Small Schools

- Information on Universal Design
- Information on Small Schools

Section 7: Separate Appendix

- Entry Form
- North Side Site Information (Maps, photos, survey)
- South Side Site Information (Maps, photos, survey)

Section 1. Introduction

In the fall of 1999, a coalition of educational reform organizations came together with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to begin the process of hosting a national design competition to build two new public schools in Chicago. In the midst of an unprecedented building boom in new school construction, groups in Chicago felt that the time was right to host a design competition for public schools – a competition that, in the words of Yale School of Architecture Dean Robert A.M. Stern, would feature "architecture in the service of democracy."

The schools that are the subjects of the Chicago Public Schools Design Competition -- Big Shoulders, Small Schools will be new pre-K-8th grade schools designed to serve an integrated population of disabled and non-disabled students. The schools will be designed with universal design principles – one of the first times nationally that universal design has been applied to new school construction. In addition, the Sponsors seek solutions for creative ways of designing larger-than-ideal school buildings to accommodate what we know work best for students – small schools. Thus, this competition is innovative in many respects. It will not only result in two new beautiful school buildings for Chicago students, but it will focus community and national attention on the programmatic importance of both universal design and small schools.

The program that follows represents the Sponsors' efforts to provide competitors with the information necessary to design these two new schools for Chicago students.

The Sponsors

The Chicago Public Schools Design Competition is sponsored by Chicago Public Schools in conjunction with the Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities ("MOPD"), Business & Professional People for the Public Interest ("BPI"), Leadership for Quality Education ("LQE"), and the Small Schools Coalition ("SSC").

The Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities was established by Mayor Richard M. Daley in January, 1991 to better meet the diverse needs of the more than 500,000 persons with disabilities who live and work in Chicago and the additional 1.5 million people with disabilities who visit Chicago each year. Chicago is the only city in the nation with a cabinet level department devoted exclusively to programs and services specifically for people with disabilities. MOPD promotes total access, full participation and equal opportunity for people with disabilities of all ages and in all aspects of life. It seeks to accomplish this mission through a multi-faceted approach that includes systemic change and education.

Business & Professional People for the Public Interest is a not-for-profit law and public policy center dedicated to equal justice and a better, more equitable quality of life for all people living in the Chicago region. BPI works to transform segregated public housing, revitalize economically disadvantaged communities, improve public education, and promote sensible metropolitan growth strategies. In its public education work, BPI has played a central role in CPS's 1995 adoption of a "small schools" policy and continues to foster the development of these more intimate and effective learning environments by strengthening existing small schools and creating the small schools Chicago still needs.

Leadership for Quality Education was formed in 1989 to serve as Chicago's senior business community's voice on school reform. LQE is an advocacy organization that focuses its energies on helping to resolve specific issues that are impediments to improving the quality of education at the local school level. It also works to identify financial and in-kind resources from a variety of national, state, and local sources to put to work on behalf of Chicago's public schools.

The Small Schools Coalition is a Chicago-based not-for-profit organization that was created in 1995 to integrate the small school concept into the fabric of school restructuring within the Chicago Public Schools. The Coalition promotes these goals by supporting and strengthening existing small schools, providing a supportive environment for the creation of new small school efforts in Chicago, researching and presenting the impact of small schools on student achievement and other educational goals, and reaching out to larger numbers of teachers, principals, parents and community members to share the small schools message.

Background

Chicago is in the midst of an aggressive Capital Improvements Program (CIP) aimed at building new schools and repairing older school facilities in Chicago. The two winning designs from the Big Shoulders Competition will be constructed and funded by the Capital Improvements Program.

The $2.6 billion CIP is the most aggressive school construction project underway anywhere in the nation. The program is driven by three major objectives: (1) Reduction of overcrowding in schools through new construction; (2) Achievement of a minimum standard of physical condition for each school through renovation; and (3) Improvement of learning through educational enhancements.

Since the CIP program began in 1996, 14 new schools, 29 additions and 27 annexes have been completed or are underway. This month, CPS opened 200 new classrooms for an increased capacity of 5,000 students. Since 1996, CPS has opened 1,100 new classrooms for an increased capacity of 31,000 students.

In every rebuilding and renovation process there is an opportunity for innovative and unique design as well as community education. In this case, that opportunity includes a chance to raise community awareness and civic consciousness about school architecture and its relationship to important educational and design philosophies. In particular, this process will focus public attention on universal design, a progressive trend in architecture to design buildings that are accessible to the broadest possible array of users, as well as the small schools philosophy, an educational movement emphasizing small, cohesive schools. To both meet this need and harness this opportunity, BPI, LQE, and SSC came together with leaders at The Chicago Public Schools and The Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities to implement a national, two-stage Design Competition – Big Shoulders, Small Schools.

The goal of the Competition is to produce high-quality designs and innovative and architecturally significant new buildings, while at the same time spotlighting generally the importance of school design and innovative methods of incorporating universal design techniques and small school philosophies in buildings that house a larger-than-ideal number of students.

These goals will be achieved through a two-stage design competition featuring both invited and open components. Prior to commencement of the open competition, the Sponsors selected (pursuant to a Request for Qualifications process) four invited architects. These four architects have agreed to participate in the competition and to compete with four finalists chosen by the Jury in Stage One of the open competition. It is the Sponsors' intent that this hybrid between an open and an invited competition structure will link the best aspects of both competition types by drawing in nationally-recognized architects to compete with the most promising talents nationally in the field of architecture and design. (For more information on the invited architects, see Section Five.)

The two schools chosen as sites for the design competition (both slated for construction by 2004) will be located on the North and South sides of Chicago and will each serve approximately 800 students in pre-k to eighth grade. The schools will serve up to 49% disabled students in grades Pre-k - kindergarten and up to 20% disabled students in grades 1-8.

The Design Competition

Incorporating the latest in design innovation with emerging educational philosophies, the Competition focuses on schools that are both small and that will integrate disabled and non-disabled students. The majority of the student body in the new schools -- roughly 75% of all students -- will be non-disabled. As such, while the needs of disabled students are certainly relevant, they should not be considered the only, or even necessarily the dominant consideration in designing the new schools. In keeping with universal design philosophies, the schools should serve as models for innovative design for all buildings of the future – accessible for all, limiting for none, flexible for changing populations and uses over time.

With that said, it is important to give some background on the types of students who will attend the schools and, in particular, the specific needs of the disabled students. The disabled students will have a range of issues, from severe limitations that inhibit mobility and require extensive physical therapy during the school day to combined physical and cognitive disabilities that require highly specialized environments and technology. In addition to serving the needs of these students, the schools will serve as technology training centers for special education teachers throughout each school's geographic region.

The needs of the students with disabilities will pose unique design challenges for architects. Currently, many CPS schools for children with disabilities occupy buildings not designed to accommodate such students. Limitations such as standard-width hallways and standard-size classrooms are particularly problematic when large numbers of students bring additional equipment and special needs to the classroom. For example, many of the disabled students at both schools will be in wheelchairs and may use various forms of therapeutic equipment on a daily basis. In addition, many of the students require special medical equipment and treatment, including oxygen tanks, specially prepared meals, and daily medicine, catheterization, bathing, or diaper changing. Because of the additional equipment and personnel required for teaching and caring for this population of students, both schools need adequate storage space and room for teacher and staff meeting and planning. In sum, there are a myriad of needs that must be accounted for in the universal design of these new schools.

While the needs of the schools' disabled populations are important and highly relevant to consider in the schools' designs, it should be emphasized that these schools will serve a relatively small percentage of disabled students. Indeed, as models of inclusion, these schools are first and foremost "universal schools." The schools will each serve approximately 800 total students, with in most cases three classes of students in each grade. As is the intent of both universal design and the movement for integration of disabled students into mainstream environments, the schools will be schools for <u>all</u> children, not merely children with disabilities. The Sponsors are seeking ideas that challenge the current thinking about the design of schools generally and that incorporate both universal design and small school principles into designs that are, at once, affordable, buildable, innovative, and beautiful.

Section 2. Description of School Communities & Sites

There will be two sites in (and two new schools that come out of) the Chicago Public Schools Design Competition. Each site is located in its own unique neighborhood and situated in geographical proximity to two existing schools whose students will eventually feed into the new competition schools.

South Side Site

The South Side site is located between 103rd and 104th Streets and between Wentworth and Princeton Avenues, in the Roseland neighborhood on the southern end of the City of Chicago. Currently, Langston Hughes Elementary School sits on 104th at the south end of the site. Residential buildings currently sit on Princeton and Wentworth Avenues and commercial buildings occupy the northern boundary of the site on 103rd street. All buildings will be cleared of the site prior to construction, with the exception of the Langston Hughes Elementary School. The existing school will remain standing until construction of the new competition school is complete.

The area surrounding the South Side site consists of a mix of residential and commercial buildings, but primarily smaller, single-family homes. The neighborhood is predominantly African American and populated by low to middle-income families. Just West of the competition site is a fire station and the Roseland Pumping Station. The site sits just four blocks South of the I-94/I-57 interchange and just North of the historic Pullman neighborhood. The site is in the 34th Ward, governed by Alderman Carrie M. Austin.

Just as the geographic communities surrounding the sites are important to the competition, so too must competitors understand the communities of students, parents, and teachers who will live, work and learn in these new buildings. At the South Side school, the student population will be made up of students currently attending Davis Developmental Center, located at 9101 South Jeffery Avenue, and students currently attending Langston Hughes Elementary School, located at 104th and Princeton.

Davis Developmental Center is a preschool for three to six-year-old children who are developmentally delayed, physically disabled, or otherwise health impaired. The school also houses a state pre-kindergarten program, which services non-disabled neighborhood children. There are approximately 85 students currently attending Davis.

The mission of Davis is to provide the educational, cultural, and artistic experiences and professional services necessary to prepare students for life-long learning and full participation in today's society.

Davis opened on March 20, 1973, in a building originally built as a Jewish community center. The students at Davis are transported to the center in a mini-bus for half-day sessions. Approximately eighty percent of the students at Davis are low-income. Almost ninety percent of the students are African American. Six percent of the students are Hispanic and four percent are white.

Davis currently has nine classroom teachers, specially trained in the areas of early childhood education, the physically, mentally and emotionally handicapped, learning disabilities and speech and language disorders. The staff provides a highly individualized program of visual, auditory, motor and sensory experiences for the students. The faculty is assisted by an auxiliary staff consisting of a Parent Effectiveness Program, physical therapists, a gross motor specialist, nurses, psychologists, speech/language pathologists, occupational therapists, a vision consultant, a teacher for the hearing impaired, a social worker, a computer teacher, a transition/inclusion teacher, and a sensory integration teacher.

Some of the special programs at Davis include a Parent Effectiveness Program, which was designed to help parents understand the special needs of their children. The program provides parents with instructional techniques that they can use at home to promote consistency and reinforcement between the child's home and school learning.

Davis also has a Readiness Program – a one-on-one program designed to provide learning experiences for those students who are developmentally prepared for introduction to readiness skills.

Finally, Davis has a Sensory Integration Program, designed to create an environment of sensory experiences for students. These experiences are designed to stimulate the senses at all levels, from passive enjoyment to active decision-making.

Langston Hughes Elementary School, which will make up the non-disabled portion of the new South Side school, currently serves approximately 500 students in grades pre-k – 8. Located in the Roseland

Community, Langston Hughes sits at 104th and Princeton Avenues, in a 100-year-old building with attached modular units.

Langston Hughes' mission is to fully develop students who are proficient in reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, science, critical thinking skills and the fine arts. The school offers a comprehensive international program, consisting of an award-winning Japanese Language and Culture Program, available to students in grades 1-5. Pre School, Kindergarten, and students in grades 6, 7, and 8 receive instruction in Spanish Language and Culture. Nearly 100% of Langston Hughes' students are African American.

Langston Hughes is one of the Chicago Systemic Initiative Schools, emphasizing improvement in math and science instruction and staff development for teachers.

North Side Site

As on the South side, the North Side site will house students from two existing schools – the Frederick Stock school, currently located at 7507 W. Birchwood Ave., and Inter-American Magnet School, located at 919 W. Barry. Both of these school communities will bring rich traditions and programs and diverse personalities and communities to the new school.

The **Frederick Stock School**, located in the Edison Park neighborhood in the Northwest corner of Chicago, serves approximately 100 pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students. The majority of students at Stock have physical and multiple disabilities, although a state pre-kindergarten program also integrates non-disabled neighborhood students with Stock's disabled population. Approximately sixty percent of Stock's students are low-income, fifty percent are white, approximately fifteen percent are African American, approximately twenty-nine percent are Hispanic and approximately seven percent are Asian.

Stock offers a highly-specialized program for its students, including extensive physical, occupational and speech therapy services, full-time nursing services for students needing tube feedings, suctioning, catheterization, and other medical treatments, an adaptive physical education program, an award-winning adapted computer program, and a parent support program. Stock was the first school in Illinois to fully include children with disabilities in a State funded pre-kindergarten program. It also won the Council of Great City Schools National Urban Education Technology Award for its computer program.

Currently, Stock is located in a small school building in a middle-class residential neighborhood. Students are bused to Stock from throughout the Northwest part of Chicago.

Inter-American Magnet School (IAMS), like Langston Hughes on the South Side, will provide the non-disabled students to the new North Side school. IAMS is a pre-kindergarten through eighth grade school currently located in the Lakeview neighborhood of Chicago. IAMS focuses on Spanish-language immersion – with students at all levels learning most subjects in Spanish. Founded by two North side mothers in 1975, IAMS is the oldest and most comprehensive dual-language program in the country. The school promotes academic excellence through bilingual, multicultural education. The school has a strong tradition of parental involvement and has a faculty that has won numerous awards, including four Golden Apple Awards for Teaching.

Since 1983, IAMS has been housed in what was built as a temporary facility at 919 W. Barry. Because IAMS is a magnet school, thirty percent of all new students admitted to the school's lottery must live within a 1.5 mile radius of the school. Currently, 634 students attend Inter-American. Eighteen percent of the students are white, fifteen percent are African American and sixty four percent are Hispanic.

Additional information about each of the school sites – including photos, maps and surveys – can be found in the Separate Appendix included in the program packet.1

1 Due to circumstances regarding land acquisition beyond the Sponsors' control, details of the North-Side site's location could not be included in this Program. This information, along with more information regarding the South-Side site, is provided in the Separate Appendix.

Section 3. The Competition Program

The Chicago Public Schools Design Competition aims to elicit submissions for schools that are innovative, feasible, sensitive to neighborhood context, and that adhere to principles of universal design and small schools educational philosophies.

The designs should reflect a spirit of innovation combined with a respect for the needs, wishes and vision of the students, parents and communities that will live and work in and around these schools. In addition, the construction and design should reflect the needs of this integrated population of disabled and non-disabled students.

The schools will serve approximately three classes of students in each grade, running pre-K - 8. Thus, the designs should reflect both appropriate structural features for these different ages of students as well as creative ways to break these large schools into several smaller schools, each serving a strand of 1st to 8th grade students.

Evaluation Criteria

The Jury will be instructed to use the following criteria as the most significant factors in evaluating the design submissions. Specifically, all submissions should be:

- Innovative

The Sponsors are seeking design solutions that are unique architecturally; that – in the words of Robert A.M. Stern – "will be looked upon by future generations as 'everyday masterpieces.'" Just as the goal of this Competition is to promote universal design and design for small schools, so to do the Sponsors want to emphasize the importance of innovation, creativity, and imagination in the architecture of public schools. We want designs to reflect the beauty, care and elegance that should be a part of all important civic architecture and that our children, parents and communities certainly deserve in their school buildings.

- Feasible

The reality of building public schools is that fiscal concerns govern how, where, and when schools get built. The project submissions should reflect sensitivity to budget issues – accounting for both construction and life cycle costs. The design solutions should be affordable to build and maintain, considering the budget for building each school is approximately $200 per square foot.[2]

Additionally, the design solutions must be functional at many programmatic levels, including mechanical and electrical systems; communications systems; physical access; flexibility and adaptability; indoor and outdoor environments; sensitivity to the variety of user groups including different types of teachers, students, parents, administrators, and the general public; public and private places; and cultural significance and symbolism.

- Sensitive to Neighborhood Context

Along with innovation comes neighborhood contextuality. To that end, community input will be crucial to successful designs. The Sponsors are looking for designs that reflect the unique ethnic, geographic and social culture of the neighborhoods of the proposed sites and that also complement existing structures, site specifications and community needs. Competitors' submissions will be judged in part on how well the architect incorporates the needs and character of the community into the final designs. To facilitate community involvement in the design process, the Sponsors will host a series of forums beginning in November 2000 so that the community can learn about small schools and universal design and provide feedback to competitors on the needs and perspectives of the communities these schools will serve.

- **Adherence to Principles of Universal Design**

The designs should also incorporate elements of universal design. Universal design is a progressive trend in architecture to design buildings that are accessible, functional and usable by people of any age, with any level of ability, and coming from any variety of cultural or social contexts. The goal of a universal design school is to maximize functionality for all users without making accommodations for any particular constituency overbearing, intrusive, or aesthetically displeasing. Going a step beyond

---

[2] This budget figure is in 2000 dollars and includes soft costs and furniture but not costs such as land, utilities, remediation, or medical equipment for the schools.

mere ADA compliance, universal design offers solutions beyond ramps and curb cuts, with design modifications that are equally sensitive to persons with visual or hearing impairments as they are to persons in wheelchairs, parents with strollers, or the elderly. Because of the importance of sustaining healthy learning environments, architects are also encouraged to utilize sustainable and green design techniques and principles whenever possible in designing the schools.

- **Adherence to Principles of Small School Design**

Educational theory and practice tell us that small schools (350 students in a K-8 elementary school and 500 students in a high school) optimize student learning, retention, safety and community. In small schools, every adult in the building knows every student and teachers have a shared sense of purpose about the educational mission and the students who pass through their classrooms.

Unfortunately (because of political and other pressures), school districts often cannot build new public schools as small as we know they should be. In the absence of truly small school buildings, however, many educators in large urban schools have begun organizing their schools into several smaller schools-within-schools. This can best be accomplished when buildings are designed from the start to accommodate this structure and educational philosophy.

Like most urban public schools, the schools that are subjects of this Competition will house too many students to be true small schools. Indeed, because of the necessary integration of non-disabled and disabled students (and related cost issues), the schools must be built to accommodate approximately 800 students. Nonetheless, the Sponsors want to bring to these schools designs that accommodate the small school philosophy. As such, we are looking for designs that can easily facilitate the schools' organization into several small schools-within-schools. By this, we mean that the buildings should be organized in a way that allows the same group of teachers to work with the same small group of students over their entire educational experience, from first to eighth grade. Thus, an ideal model of schools-within-schools for an 800 person building would be two to three separate schools, grades 1-8, each housing one class per grade.

Because core small school educational principles include the idea that effective schools have a coherent curricular focus that provides a continuous educational experience across a range of grades, it is important that the schools be broken down *vertically* and not into horizontal schools with students grouped by age. Indeed, with the exception of the early childhood component (pre-k and kindergarten), which should typically be housed separately from the older grades. The benefit of a vertically integrated model for small schools is that a core group of teachers can work with the same group of students over their entire educational experience.

The Program

The Jury will use the evaluative criteria outlined above as the primary determinants of the winning schemes. The following are specific design components that are relevant to both the North and South side sites. These components are general guidelines and do not supersede the evaluative criteria. Following a discussion of these guidelines for design components is a detailed facilities program listing square foot and other guidelines for each school.

Architectural Goals:
Designers should consider the following architectural goals as key to the design of these schools:

- Architecture to maximize student independence.
- Spaces to foster integration and cooperation and encourage student interaction.
- Architecture to foster learning through an array of building materials.
- Environment to encourage interactive exploration and learning with a variety of mediums (such as plants, sand, etc.).
- Architecture with an inherent, understandable order. Confusing circulation paths and a complex building structure should be avoided.
- A non-institutional, child-centered learning environment.
- Environment with a variety of visual cues and other orientation aids.

School Site:
The overall design for the school site should include the following characteristics:

- A bus drop-off and, preferably, a covered canopy.
- A waiting area for up to five school buses.
- Adequate space for an accessible playground and an outdoor "discovery garden."
- Unobstructed areas at the major wings of the buildings for emergency vehicles.
- On-site parking for a minimum of 80 cars.

Common Elements:
Each school will have 30 total classrooms and approximately three standard classrooms per grade. In addition to 30 classrooms, the schools will have at least one science lab, art classroom, and music classroom. Ideally, each small school within each building would have its own labs as well as art and music rooms. Additional support spaces include five conference/viewing rooms, an administrative center, a library, a health support center, an assistive technology lab, a student services office, an engineer's office, a kitchen and dining room, and a gymnasium. There must also be at least one multi-purpose room available for the entire school.

The common building elements include the following:

- **Entrance/s:**
  - Typically, a school entrance would feature an administrative center including offices and a reception area, a parent meeting area/conference room, faculty mailboxes, and a workroom/vault with steel door. Although it need not necessarily be located near the school entrance, the administrative center must be on the first floor.
  - The entrance would also feature a Commons Area for student gathering, with visual access to bus and car drop-off area.[3]

- **Centralized Support Spaces:**
  There are a number of large, common components of each building that will be shared by all the buildings' small schools. For example:
  - The Dining Room should be functional as a multi-purpose room. It must be on ground level.
  - The Kitchen should have a segregated food preparation area to prepare special meals.
  - The Gymnasium should have office and storage space included. It must be on the ground floor.
  - The Library should have a separate workroom/storage area. It must accommodate up to 30 computer stations.

[3] Architects may want to consider separate entrances for each school-within-a-school.

- **Multi-Purpose Room:**
    - The schools will have a multi-purpose room configured as two classrooms of equal size, divided by a partition wall.
    - The schools should also have a multi-sensory room for sensory stimulation of severely disabled students. This room in particular must allow adequate wheelchair storage space. Multi-sensory equipment in the room could include a sensory solar projector, a corral ball pool, soft play-center equipment, a music/sound system, a disco ball with rotating lights, or a wheel rotator for liquid effect wheels.

<u>Specialized Services Support Spaces</u>:
Each building will have a number of spaces designed to deal with students' health concerns. For example:

- A Health Support Center, including a reception area and three treatment rooms, at least one toilet training room, and a general office.
- A Therapist Workroom with a minimum of eight workstations, allowing for confidential evaluation and conferences.
- An Assistive Technology Lab to serve as a training area for special education teachers in each demographic region and an evaluation center for students in the school and region. This Lab should accommodate eight workstations (approx. 4.5' wide by 3' deep), an evaluation room with thirty workstations, and a secured storage room with a vault door and no window access.
- General Storage for therapy equipment, wheelchairs, etc., should be provided for throughout the building.

<u>Early Childhood Elements (Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten)</u>:
Up to 50% of the students at this level will have disabilities. Each school will house six classrooms for pre-k and kindergarten students. Design elements for this population of students include:

- 1200 SF Classrooms. These classrooms must be on the ground floor and have adjacent storage area and lockable wall cabinet storage systems. Each classroom must have its own bathroom.
- Two Conference / Parent Viewing Rooms (one at 200 SF; one at 100 SF). These rooms will contain one-way mirrors and should maximize the number of view windows per conference room.
- Early Childhood Discovery Center dedicated to interactive therapy and motor development for disabled students. This room typically contains equipment such as large therapy equipment, soft play-center furniture, child-level mirrors, rugs and support pillows, padded mats, and water bins, and plants. This, too, must be on the ground floor. Ideally, it opens into an outdoor discovery garden for year-round use.
- Early Childhood Restroom Cores should have a minimum of three accessible stalls for each gender and should contain at least four separate changing rooms. Changing rooms should support tables and storage cubbies for 10 - 20 students. At least one changing room must have a small-attached toilet room, with bathtub and sink.

<u>Elementary Elements (Grades 1-8)</u>:
The schools will have 24 elementary classrooms. Each grade level will have approximately three classrooms per grade. Up to 20% of the students at this level will have disabilities. Design elements for this population of students include:

- 900 SF Classrooms with adjacent storage area and lockable wall cabinet storage systems.
- Three Conference / Parent Viewing Rooms (1 at 200 SF and 2 at 100 SF). These have the same elements as Early Childhood Conference / Parent Viewing Rooms.
- An Elementary Discovery Center with the same elements as the Early Childhood Discovery Center.
- At least one Science Lab at 1000 SF. must have dedicated storage/prep room, sinks, and workstations for a maximum of 25 students.
- At least one Music Room at 1000 SF. must have dedicated storage area for instruments.
- At least one Art Room at 1000 SF. must have dedicated art storage area, two sinks and adequate counter space for projects.

- Elementary Restroom Cores with a minimum of three accessible stalls for each gender, two separate changing rooms with changing tables and storage area for 10-20 students. One changing room must have a small toilet room attached.

Circulation Spaces:
Each school must have the following elements as circulation spaces:

- **Corridors:**
  - Each corridor is to have an alcove space for wheelchair parking outside each classroom and shared student spaces.
  - A large one or two story building with long corridors may have 'fire separations' between wings, assuming a longer exiting time for students with mobility limitations.
  - Minimum corridor width is 15'-0".

- **Exit Stairs:**
  - Exit stairs to have a minimum tread width of 6'–0".
  - The "Area of Rescue Assistance" in the stair tower is to accommodate a minimum of two wheelchairs.

- **Elevator Cores:**
  - Elevator core to accommodate a minimum of two elevators.
  - At least one elevator should accommodate a teacher and up to five students in wheelchairs.

The Facilities Program

The Facilities Program that follows indicates basic square footage and classroom requirements for these schools. This Facilities Program is the exclusive product of the Chicago Public Schools and may be used only for purposes of this competition.

Classrooms and Support Spaces	Number
Pre-K and K classrooms @ 1200 SF	6
Elementary Classrooms @900 SF	24
Science Lab	1
Art Classroom	1
Music Classroom	1
Multi-Purpose Room	1
Total Classrooms	34
Support Spaces	
Conference/Viewing Room	5
Administrative Center	1
Library	1
Health Support Center	1
Assistive Technology Lab	1
Student Services	1
Engineer's Office	1
Dining/Multi-Purpose Gymnasium	1
Total Support Spaces	12
Non-Program Area	42,700 sq. ft.
Program Area	64,050 sq. ft.
Total Building Area	106,750 sq. ft.

Space Category	Square Footage
Administration Center	
Administration Reception	175
School Business Office	275
Conference Room	600
School Vault/Work Room	300
Communication Console	50
Faculty Mail Boxes	50
Administrative Office	150
Administrative Office	150
Student Services	150
Faculty Center	900
Counselor's Office	150
Parent Room	600
Total	3,550
Dining Center	
Student Dining – incorporating a commons area	3,500
Kitchen & Serving (Full Service)	2,500
Dishwashing	150
Storage	250
Office	100
Total	6,500
Support Areas	
Library & Resource Room	2,750
Library Workroom/Storage	200
Art Room	1,000
Music Room	1,000
Science Lab	1,000
Science Storage	200
General Storage 4 @ 100	400
Multi-Purpose Room Storage	225
Gymnasium	3,750
Gym Office	150
Gym Storage	450
Total	11,125

Teaching Stations & Support Spaces	
24 @ 900	21,600
6 @ 1200 (Pre-K & K)	7,200
3 @ 100 Conference/Viewing Rooms	300
2 @ 200 Conference/Viewing Rooms	400
Multi-Purpose Room	1,800
30 @ 10 SF Wheelchair Storage	3,000
Total	34,300
Health Support Center	
Office	500
Reception	300
Nurses Station & Med. Storage	300
Toilet training room 1 @ 100	100
Exam rooms 3 @ 100	300
Total	1,500
Therapists Workroom	
Therapists Workroom	600
Individual Evaluation Room	200
Assistive Technology Training Center/Lab	900
Assistive Technology Workroom	600
Assistive Technology Storage	900
General Equipment Storage	900
Total	4,100
Sensory Stimulation Room	
Sensory Stimulation Room	900
Wheelchair Storage	100
Sensory Stimulation Room Storage	200
Total	1,200
Discovery Center	
Discovery Center 2 @ 1,200	2,400
Discovery Room Storage 2 @ 200	400
Wheelchair Storage 2 @ 100	200
Total	1,200
Miscellaneous Engineers Area	
MDF Room	200
Office	125
Storage	250
Total	575

AREA ALLOCATION SUMMARY

Program Total @ 60% Total Building Area	64,050 sq.ft.
Non-Program Total @ 40% Total Building Area (Circulation, mep, tenants, etc.)	42,700 sq.ft.
Total Building Area	106,750sq.ft.

General Guidelines

While conformance to all elements of these program guidelines is considered desirable, it is also understood that innovation and design excellence are the primary concerns. Therefore minor deviations from these program requirements shall not be considered a failure to meet the basic competition criteria. In addition, the jurors may, if they so choose, disregard failures to meet programmatic guidelines if, in their opinion, such failures are not central to the design intent and could be easily remedied in the conventional design development process to follow.

Zoning and Code Information

Competitors should be aware of relevant codes applicable to school construction. These include the following:

- Building Code:
  Chicago Building Code 1999 (CBC)
- Accessibility Code:
  Illinois Accessibility Code – April 24, 1997 (IAC)
- Accessibility Code:
  Americans with Disabilities Act – July 26, 1991 (ADA)

Section 4. Presentation Requirements

Presentation requirements have been developed to insure that the Jury will have sufficient information to effectively evaluate and compare individual solutions. In preparing the presentation, competitors should give consideration to the varied backgrounds of the jurors.

Presentation Format

The presentation materials for Stage One should be mounted on two 24" x 36" stiff boards (preferably from core). The boards should be oriented horizontally. All plans should be drawn with north at the top of the board. There should be no physical projections from the surface of the boards. Drawings should NOT be framed or covered in plastic or glass. Use only one side of the boards.

Presentation Content

Required Materials:

Competitors must include the following in their submissions:

- Site plan that identifies the location of the design solution(s) and other relevant site information.
- Street elevation of the design solution(s) within the context of immediately adjacent structures.
- Floor plans and sections that designate the function of individual spaces.
- The preferred scale for the site plan should be 1" = 40'. The scale of the floor plans should be 1" = 20' or 1/16 = 1'-0". It is understood that, depending on the competitor's concept, minor changes in scale might be needed. For example, major elevations might be at the preferred scale, but other elevations might vary.
- Competitors should indicate how the submission meets the program requirements and evaluation criteria in text and/or graphic material.

Optional Materials:

In addition to these required elements, other drawings, graphics or text may be used to describe significant qualities and characteristics of the design. For example, competitors should indicate critical material selections and locations. Text or sketches might also indicate how the submission meets the program requirements and evaluation criteria.

Any material not presented directly on the board will not be accepted as part of the presentation. Please be reminded that the purpose of the presentation is to clearly and directly communicate the competitor's intentions and designs to the Jury.

Presentation Techniques

Presentation techniques are entirely at the discretion of the competitors. For example: materials may be black and white or color, drawings may be photographic reproductions or originals, photography of models and any other 3-D material is acceptable (models are not permitted).

Section 5. Procedures and Regulations

Eligibility

The open phase of the Chicago Public Schools Design Competition is a national, two-stage competition open to all licensed architects and architecture and design students. If selected for the second stage, any non-licensed entrants must affiliate with a licensed architect. The open competition process will be judged anonymously.

There is also an invited component to this Competition. As a result of an RFQ issued in July, 2000 to a group of architects nationally, four invited participants were chosen by the Sponsors to compete with the four finalists chosen by the Jury from stage one of the open competition.

Site Selection

Competitors must select one of the two offered sites and propose a solution relevant to one site only (to be chosen at the discretion of the competitor). If competitors wish to present a design for each site, they must register twice – one entry fee for each site. In stage one, two finalists will be chosen for each site. These finalists will then compete against two of the invited architects also working on that site. The Jury will choose a first, second and third place winner for both the North and South side sites. CPS will begin construction on both schools no later than 2004.

Competition Registration and Entry

To register for the competition, entrants must submit a letter with a check or money order in the amount of $95. The registration fee should be payable to BPI and addressed to BPI, c/o Jennifer Salvatore, 25 E. Washington, Ste. 1515, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

To officially enter the Competition, each entrant must complete the Entry Form, found in the Separate Appendix. The Entry Form should be returned with each competitor's submission. In signing the Entry Form, registrants acknowledge that they have read, understand and agree to abide by all of the procedures, regulations and conditions of the Competition as printed in the Competition Program.

Disqualification

Submissions that do not comply with the procedures, regulations and required materials of the Competition may be declared ineligible prior to judging. The qualification process will be reviewed with the Jury before the judging. The decision of the Competition Advisor in regard to disqualifying submissions not in compliance with the Competition Program procedures and regulations will be final.

The Competition Advisor

The Competition Advisor is Design Competition Services, Inc., a professional design competition consultant company based in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The Competition Advisor will assist in the planning and administration of the Competition. The Competition Advisor's responsibility is to ensure that the Competition is organized and conducted in a professional and equitable manner. The Advisor will be present during the Jury deliberations to provide technical assistance and to instruct the Jury regarding its deliberations and awards.

The Advisor will act as arbitrator for all inquiries and disputes during the course of the Competition. Inquiries by competitors should be directed to the Sponsor, BPI, c/o Jennifer Salvatore (312.641.5570/ jennifersalvatore@hotmail.com) who will then answer questions or direct questions to the Advisor. Disputes or questions of interpretation arising from the Competition procedures, regulations and criteria will be considered by the Advisor, who will render a final determination.

The Jury

The Jury members are bound by the written criteria, procedures and regulations found in this Competition Program. The Jury has the sole responsibility and authority to select the winning designs and the number of winners. All Jury decisions are final. The sponsors will be bound by the decision of the Jury.

The Jury for the CPS Design Competition is composed of highly talented and diverse representatives of the architecture, educational and Chicago communities, including:

Dr. William Ayers, a school reform activist, Distinguished Professor of Education, and Senior University Scholar at the University of Illinois at Chicago. At UIC, Dr. Ayers teaches courses in interpretive research, urban school change, teaching for justice and democracy, youth and the modern predicament, and the cultural contexts of teaching. He is founder of the Center for Youth and Society, co-director of the Small Schools Workshop, co-founder of the Annenberg Challenge in Chicago, and co-chair of the Chicago School Reform Collaborative.

Lance Jay Brown, AIA, Chair/ Director of the School of Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban Design, the City College of the City University of New York and principal of Lance Jay Brown, Architecture + Urban Design in New York City. From 1979-1984 Mr. Brown was Assistant Director of the Design Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts. He has received numerous academic and professional honors. Recent professional activities include being special advisor to the 1997 Mostar 2004 Urban Reconstruction Workshop, Bosnia Hercegovina and co-directing Crosstown 116: Bringing Habitat II Home From Istanbul to Harlem.

Ralph Johnson, FAIA, a leading architect and Vice President of the Chicago firm Perkins & Will, has been honored with over 30 design awards, including five national Honor Awards and 23 regional Honor Awards from the American Institute of Architects. Twice the Chicago Tribune as a Chicagoan in the Arts has chosen Mr. Johnson, and Rizzoli published his collected works in September of 1995 and by l'Arcaedizioni in 1998.

M. David Lee, FAIA, Vice President of Stull & Lee, Inc., an architecture and urban design firm in Boston, Massachusetts. Mr. Lee has directed a broad range of planning, urban design and architectural projects, including the Morning Star Baptist Church in Roxbury, a K-8 school in Boston, and a master plan for the city of Roxbury. Mr. Lee is an Adjunct Professor in Urban design at Harvard's Graduate School of Design. He served as the President of the Boston Society of Architects in 1992 and is the recipient of the Society's 2000 Award of Honor.

Dr. Giacomo Mancuso, Director of Programming and Demographics for the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). Dr. Mancuso has been with CPS for 30 years, first as a teacher then as Assistant Director of Bilingual Education. In 1983, he transferred to the business side of CPS, spending a year in the office of the Chief Financial Officer. Since 1984, Dr. Mancuso has worked in capital planning. In his current position, Dr. Mancuso evaluates and recommends the location and programmatic capacities of new school facilities.

Brigitte Shim, AIA, a principal of Shim-Sutcliffe Architects in Toronto, an architecture and design firm interested in the integration of furniture, architecture and landscape. Her firm's architectural work has been honored with five Governor General's Medals and Awards for Architecture along with AIA and numerous other awards. A faculty member at the University of Toronto since 1988, Ms. Shim has taught a broad range of studios and a lecture course in the history and theory of landscape architecture. Ms. Shim has been an invited visiting professor at Harvard's Graduate School of Design and has lectured throughout the U.S., Canada and New Zealand.

Two School and Community Representatives, who will be identified at a later date, will also serve on the Jury.

The Invited Architects

As a way to combine the best democratic aspects of an open national competition with the high-profile excitement of an invited process, the competition Sponsors have crafted a unique competition structure, whereby four prominent architects were chosen up-front as participants in the Big Shoulders competition. These high-caliber architects come from the four corners of the United States -- Chicago, New York, Atlanta, and Los Angeles. Following are brief profiles of the four invited architects:

Carol Ross Barney is the founder and president of Ross Barney + Jankowski, a Chicago-based firm. Her work has been published in national and international journals and has received distinguished honors and awards including the Federal Design Achievement Award from the Presidential Design Awards Program, three Institute Honor Awards from the American Institute of Architects, and fourteen AIA Chicago Chapter Awards. Ms. Barney was recently appointed by Vice President Al Gore, and the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, to plan and participate in the White House Millenium Council's joint program with the U.S. Department of Education – A National Symposium on School Design: Schools as Centers of Community. Ms. Barney has received significant design awards for her school designs. Her design of the Little Village Academy in Chicago received the first Richard H. Driehaus Foundation Award for Excellence in community design. For the Cesar Chavez Multicultural Academic Center, also in Chicago, Ms. Barney received the AIA National Honor Award. In addition, Ms. Barney has worked on the redesign of the Young Women's Leadership Charter School and has received the commission for the new Federal Campus in Oklahoma City.

Julie Eizenberg and Hank Koning are founding Principals of Koning Eizenberg Architecture in Santa Monica, California. Koning Eizenberg Architecture has received recognition for its work in housing and community-based projects, receiving awards such as the Progressive Architecture First Award and National AIA Honor Awards for affordable housing. In 1999, the firm received the City of Santa Monica's Sustainable Design Award, the Los Angeles AIA (Merit Award) and the California AIA (Honor Award) for PS#1 Elementary School, a progressive, small elementary school in Santa Monica. Ms. Eizenberg teaches part time at UCLA's Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, lectures extensively in the U.S. and abroad and serves on numerous award juries. Ms. Eizenberg and Mr. Koning have also both taught at UCLA's Graduate School of Architecture & Urban Planning, as well as at Yale School of Architecture, MIT, and the Graduate School of Design at Harvard. Ms. Eizenberg and Mr. Koning are registered architects in both California and Australia.

Mack Scogin and Merrill Elam are principals in the firm of Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects in Atlanta, Georgia. In addition to her practice, Ms. Elam lectures and teaches frequently, having served as a Visiting Critic at the Harvard University Graduate School of Design and SCI-ARC, Southern California Institute of Architecture, the University of Illinois at Chicago, Yale University, and the University of Virginia. Mr. Scogin is recent past chairman of the Harvard University Graduate School of Design and continues as an Adjunct Professor of Architecture. The firm received the 1995 Academy Award in Architecture from the American Academy of Arts and Letters and the 1996 Chrysler Award for Innovation in Design. Their work has received five national AIA Awards for Excellence. Ms. Elam and Mr. Scogin have experience designing for children, including the Corning Child Development Center featured in the July 1994 issue of Architecture Magazine. They have also designed a number of award-winning public libraries in Atlanta.

Henry Smith-Miller and Laurie Hawkinson are principals in the New York City-based architecture and urban planning firm of Smith-Miller + Hawkinson Architects. Founded in 1983, the firm has designed public and private buildings across the United States, ranging from residential commissions and parks to corporate buildings, public transportation terminals and museums. Recent award-winning projects include the North Carolina Museum of Art Amphitheater and Outdoor Cinema -- a project emphasizing the public experience of music and dance performances and cinema viewing – and the Continental Airlines Facilities. Mr. Smith-Miller has held many visiting professor positions across the country and has served on the Board of Creative Time in New York. He is currently a member of the Associate Council of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Ms. Hawkinson is an associate professor of architecture at Columbia University in New York and the director of the Core Studios Master of Architecture Degree Program at Columbia. She currently serves as a member of the design Review Board for the Ohio State University and as a "peer reviewer" for the General Service Administration of the NEA. She was recently awarded an AISC/AIA award for architecture.

Review of Stage One Finalists

Entries in the open competition will be reviewed and juried according to the evaluative criteria. The Jury will be asked to provide their insights, criticisms, and suggestions regarding Stage One finalists and the competition as a whole. Comments, however, will not be attributed to individual jurors.

Preparation of Stage Two Program

The Sponsors regarding Stage Two designs will issue a separate program statement. This statement is anticipated to incorporate comments from the jurors, the community workshops, the Sponsors and/or their designated representatives. Such program statements are anticipated to be brief and are intended simply to clarify programmatic goals that will help make the Stage Two submissions more effective.

Stage Two Procedures, Jury Process and Presentation

The final process for review and judging of Stage Two entries will be established subsequent to the completion of the Stage One jurying. At this time, the process is expected to include the following:

- Presentation requirements may be more elaborate, requiring more detailed drawings.
- All competitors will be asked to limit their presentations to the same size.
- Some form of model will be requested.
- If, at the conclusion of Stage One, the Sponsors determine that there are significant issues regarding feasibility and conceptual cost, some additional requirements and procedures may be developed.
- The presentations will be required to be delivered a few days prior to the jurying.
- The sponsors and their representatives will review the presentations.
- The jury will be given one day to review all submissions prior to formal presentations.
- The finalists will present their work over a two-day period. Each presentation will last approximately 1.5 hours, focusing substantially on discussion with the jurors. These presentations will be closed to the public.
- The Jury will select the winners and prepare written statements regarding their collective decision.

Competition Web Site

An additional way of involving both the local and national communities in the Competition process is through the CPS Design Competition website, located at www.schooldesigncomp.org. This website, which contains programmatic materials and other details about the Competition, will serve as a forum for viewing finalist designs as well as a method of educating the public about universal design, small schools, and school architecture generally.

Finalist Stipends and Awards

Each of the four finalists from the open part of the competition, as well as the four invited architects selected from the RFQ process will receive a $15,000 stipend. The winning architect for each site will receive the first right and first option to negotiate with CPS for the design commission to build the school. (In order to obtain this contract, the architect must conform to regulations regarding professional licensure in Illinois).

Community/Neighborhood Workshops

To both provide competitors with a sense of the communities' needs and preferences and to involve the broader public in the Competition, the Sponsors will host a series of workshops and community forums throughout the competition process. These forums will begin in the fall, 2000 with an evening presentation on universal design principles and small schools educational philosophy. The first forums will be held on November 12 at 4 p.m. (North side site) and November 13 at 6 p.m. (South side site).

Following the November presentation on the Competition's two key evaluative criteria, and subsequent to the selection of the finalists, the Sponsors will host two interactive forums in January and February 2001. These forums are designed to both give finalists a sense of the communities' needs and thoughts on school design and to give community members and other stakeholders an opportunity to provide feedback to finalists on their designs. Summaries of all community forums will be posted on the design competition web site. Videotapes will be available for a minimal fee. (See the competition web site for updated details about all community forums.)

Announcement of Competition Winners

Results of the Design Competition will be announced in March of 2001. There will be an exhibit and awards presentation shortly thereafter.

Ownership and Use of Submissions

All submissions shall become the property of the Sponsors, who reserve the right to publish, display, reproduce or otherwise publicize all presentations. No feature of any submission shall be reproduced in any manner without due credit being given to the designer(s) of the submission.

After announcement of the winning submissions, any submission may be publicized by the designer(s) with due credit given to the Sponsors of the Competition.

Ownership of Designs

It is the responsibility of the competitors to copyright or patent their designs if they so desire. The copyright and/or patent rights remain the property of the competitors. Upon delivery to the Sponsors, the presentation submission will become the property of the Sponsors of the Competition.

CPS intends, pending funding, to build the winning designs on the competition sites with construction to begin no later than 2004. In the event that the Sponsors select a submission for construction, the designer(s) has the first right to negotiate with CPS for the design commission.

Anonymity of Submissions

The open phase of the Competition will be judged anonymously. That is, the Jury will not know which design belongs to which designer(s) until after awards have been made. In the second round of jurying, the community and jurors will provide feedback to competitors on their designs and finalists will present to the Jury. Thus, this stage of the Competition will not be anonymous.

No names of any individual competitor or any identifying marks or symbols may appear on any presentation submitted as a part of the open competition.

Packaging and Delivery of Submissions

All submissions must be addressed to: Jennifer Salvatore, BPI, 25 E. Washington, Suite 1515, Chicago, IL 60602.

All submissions must be postmarked to the above address by January 12, 2001, and must arrive prior to the beginning of jury deliberations. Hand-delivered submissions are accepted provided that they arrive at the above delivery address prior to 5 p.m. on January 12, 2001, local time.

To ensure anonymity, competitors must assign themselves a randomly chosen 8-digit number. This number shall appear on the Entry Form where indicated AND at the lower right-hand corner of the backside of each presentation board. The completed Entry Form should be placed in a plain opaque sealed envelope and securely affixed to the reverse side of each presentation board.

Competitors are advised to consider express mail services that can guarantee delivery in one or two days. Late deliveries due to mail service delays or for any other reason will not be eligible for consideration. The Sponsors bear no responsibility whatsoever for the safe and timely delivery

of the submission to the Sponsors.

Submissions must be suitably packaged for air or surface transport and handling. Should a damaged design proposal be received, the Competition Advisor will determine whether the submission is suitable for Jury assessment.

Competitors are advised to insure their design submission and to make copies before mailing.

Return of Submissions

No provisions will be made by the Sponsors to mail or ship any entry back to the competitors. Presentation boards that are not selected for exhibition or publication will be available for pick up at a specified time and location. If a competitor would like information about the return policy, please enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope with the Entry Form.

Schedule

Following is a schedule of key dates involving the Design Competition:

Registration Opens:	September 1, 2000
Programs Available:	September 29, 2000
Registration Closes:	December 1, 2000
Community Meetings:	November 12 &13, 2000 January/February, 2001
First Stage Submissions Due:	January 12, 2001
Second Stage Submissions Due:	February 28, 2001
Winners Announced:	March, 2001
Awards Banquet/Exhibit:	March/April, 2001

Section 6. Universal Design & Small Schools

Two of the key themes of the Big Shoulders, Small Schools competition are universal design and small schools. To provide competitors with a sense of these philosophies, a short description of each follow. We encourage competitors to do additional independent research on these issues and to attend the November community forums dealing with these themes.

Universal Design

Universal design is the art and science of creating products and buildings that are functional, accessible and attractive to all types of people. Work with universal design stemmed in part from accessible design and technology. With the help of the Americans with Disabilities Act and other recent legislation, architects and designers have become much more aware of the impact of their work on those with disabilities, and have worked to improve the accessibility of their products. However, universal design goes well beyond simple compliance with legislation. Unlike accessible design, universal design is not disability-centered. Instead, it incorporates all principles of sound design (such as functionalism and aesthetics) and combines them with the concept of accessibility to create buildings and products that are better for everyone.

A building built with universal design principles would incorporate accessibility features into the regular environment: ramps instead of stairs, levers instead of doorknobs and wheel chair access in general toilet rooms. However, universal design also recognizes the needs of those who are not disabled but appreciate an environment designed to fit their needs: families and people with children, left-handed and right-handed people, elderly and young people, short people and tall people; in short, everyone. Instead of creating separate, stigmatizing environments for those with special needs, universal designs are aesthetically pleasing and have mass appeal.

In schools, issues of universal design are especially important in terms both of integrating students with disabilities into the general school population and teaching all children a respect for diversity and recognition of the needs of others. According to researcher Flora Gathorne-Hardy, schools designed with universal design principles in mind would not only be accessible to the traditionally disabled student but would "foster small group play, combat bullying, create spaces for reflection and privacy and enable pupils to feel a sense of ownership over the schools in which they spend the bulk of their time." Schools built with universal design principles use the mediums of architecture and design to challenge, nurture and teach *all* children.

Universal Design Also Means Accessible, Healthy and Sustainable Environments.

A related design issue that the Sponsors wish to encourage competitors to consider is the use of sustainable products and green design techniques to encourage healthy learning and working environments. Sustainable design focuses on the capability of natural and cultural systems to maintain them over time. Green design includes the use of environmentally friendly and recycled materials, energy efficient and toxin-free environments, cleaner indoor air and the use of natural light, among other things.

For more information about universal design and sustainable design, see the following resources:

- "What is Universal Design?" at www.design.ncsu.edu
- "The Concept of Universal Design" at www.arch.buffalo.edu
- "Studying Places: Towards Inclusive School Environments" at www.cae.org.uk.education
- Guiding Principles of Sustainable Design, U.S. Dep't of the Interior, 1993.
- A Primer on Sustainable Building, Rocky Mountain Institute, Green Development Services, 1995.

Small Schools

Research on the benefits of small schools shows that the goals of primary and secondary education are best met when students and teachers are housed in an intimate environment that fosters interaction and minimizes isolation within the school community. Designed to accommodate no more than 350 elementary school (K-8) students or no more than 500 high school students, an ideal small school is housed alone in its own building. However, larger buildings housing separate, autonomous schools under one roof also can be effective, especially if thoughtful design provides for the physical autonomy of each school.

This autonomy facilitates a more flexible, responsive management style, enabling teachers and administrators to adopt school policies that accurately reflect changing circumstances and individual needs. Small schools tend to be developed around a coherent educational focus, often concentrating on one educational theme such as fine arts or math and science. This feature enables students to enjoy a continuous, integrated educational experience that endures from grade to grade.

In a small school, teachers are able to know all students by name, preventing students from "falling through the cracks" and enabling instruction to be tailored to students' individualized needs. Increased familiarity within the school community also facilitates meaningful daily contact between students and teachers, decreasing feelings of isolation and improving discipline and safety. Students who advance through a small school develop and maintain long-term relationships with teachers, fostering a family-like environment in which they feel supported and encouraged to do their best. In addition, small schools provide students with increased opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities, offering them more creative outlets and promoting school pride.

The same benefits that students derive from more intimate surroundings are also bestowed upon teachers. Teachers in small schools are self-selected and actively involved in the creation and implementation of the school's philosophy. When their input is taken seriously, teachers are more likely to work as a team, seek support from one another and share innovative educational ideas. Moreover, small schools offer teachers more autonomy and control over their day-to-day working environment, increasing job satisfaction and performance while improving recruitment and retention of top-quality educators.

Studies show that students in small schools generally make greater gains than average on standardized tests, have higher attendance and graduation rates, and are more likely to participate in extracurricular activities than their counterparts in large public schools. In addition, students in small schools are less likely to use drugs, commit violent acts or have disciplinary or behavioral problems at school. These encouraging results have led to increased support for the small schools philosophy in urban school districts nationwide.

Good Design Can Facilitate the Small Schools Philosophy.

Infrastructure plays an important role in ensuring the success of a small school. Intimacy in a school setting can be achieved only if the surrounding environment enhances this community spirit and does not detract from the small school's overall goals. It is imperative that small schools have a non-institutional feel so that students develop an emotional attachment to their school and see it as their home away from home. Incorporating visually stimulating, culturally significant architectural features into the school building and creating an easily navigable building plan are examples of ways to achieve this effect. In addition, the layout and appearance of each area within a building should be age-appropriate and ability-specific, reflecting the individualized needs of the students who will use it.

To foster interaction between students, the school should include several large, open meeting spaces. Teachers also should have access to meeting areas for planning meetings and interacting with administrative staff and parents. All areas, however, should be designed with flexibility in mind, so that a space can be used for more than one purpose and reconfigured as necessary.

Ideally, each small school would be housed in a building all its own, creating a self-contained universe in which students and teachers could develop meaningful relationships with one another and maintain them over time. However, it is possible for a larger school to divide itself into several small schools within one building, if a number of guidelines are kept in mind.

For example, because the small schools philosophy emphasizes the importance of a core group of adults developing relationships with a group of students over time, experience and research have shown that the ideal way of breaking down a large school of 800 students is to divide it into several smaller schools, each serving one class of students in grades 1 to 8.

Additionally, the layout of any large school building must enable each small school to maintain a distinct identity. Thus, separate entrances for each school may be necessary, while certain walkways, common areas and other facilities should be dedicated solely for use by one small school. The location of classrooms and offices should foster interaction, both meaningful and incidental, between students and teachers from separate grades within the same small school. If each small school is centered on a different curricular focus, then facilities within each small school's area should be tailored accordingly. While practicality may require some common areas (such as dining or athletic space) to be shared by the entire building, every effort should be made to ensure that the overall design preserves the integrity of each small school unit within a larger building facility.

Section 7. Separate Appendix

For the Entry Form and more information on the North and South side sites, see the Separate Appendix contained in this program packet.

Dated: September 28, 2000